

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/813,214	MOGENSEN ET AL.
	Examiner Elizabeth R. MacNeill	Art Unit 3767

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Elizabeth R. MacNeill. (3) Heidi Dare.
 (2) Kevin Sirmons. (4) Michael Chu.

Date of Interview: 27 November 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Funderburk.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner will review the limitations that the cover assures sterile conditions of said insertion set within the device housing. The examiner also suggested using method claims to define certain features of the invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

KEVIN C. SIRMONS
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required